

RUBICON TRAIL MASTER PLAN

FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS AND REPORT

Prepared by:



ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP & PLANNING
INCORPORATED

Environmental Stewardship and Planning, Inc.
1621 13th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

December 2007

Contents of Report

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
Alternative A	1
Alternative B	2
Conclusions	3
ALTERNATIVE A FISCAL IMPLICATIONS OF IMPLEMENTATION.....	5
Management of the Rubicon Trail.....	7
Who Manages the Trail?	8
General Services Staffing and Support.....	9
Operations	10
Expenditure Categories.....	10
Estimated Annual Funding Requirements	11
Principal Managing Department – General Services.....	11
Other Departments’ Detail	12
Department of Transportation Role and Resource Commitment.....	12
Environmental Management	13
County Surveyor-GIS Division	15
Sheriff.....	15
Total Estimated Cost of Program	17
Program Cost Reduction Considerations	18
Program Revenue.....	20
Trust Fund vs. Special Revenue Fund	21
New Ordinances Establishing Fines and Fine Revenue	21
Grants from OHV Sources.....	22
TUA Fees	23
Expense/Revenue Summary	25
ALTERNATIVE B	27
Known Revenues	27

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Under its agreement with El Dorado County (County) to prepare an Environmental Impact Report evaluating the County's proposed Rubicon Trail Master Plan (RTMP), Environmental Stewardship and Planning (ESP) has prepared a fiscal analysis to assist the Board of Supervisors (Board) in its consideration of the RTMP. The purpose of this analysis is to provide the County with an evaluation of the fiscal impacts associated with implementation of the RTMP, particularly those impacts associated with implementation of either of the RTMP Alternatives: Alternative "A" and Alternative "B" of the Plan. Alternative A represents an affirmative statement of intent on the part of the County to actively manage the Rubicon Trail as an off-highway recreational vehicle asset. In contrast to Alternative A, the RTMP Alternative B makes no specific demands upon the County with respect to management of the Rubicon Trail.

Alternative A

In reviewing the many actions associated with implementing this Alternative, we examine the activities of those principal and supporting County departments and the staffing requirements for carrying out their respective tasks. The General Services Department through its Division of Airports, Parks and Grounds and the County Department of Transportation (DOT) through its Road Maintenance Division have principal managing responsibility over the Trail. Other County departments identified as playing important supportive roles include Environmental Management (DEM), County Surveyor-GIS Division and the County Sheriff.

In the course of this analysis ESP met and interviewed over 20 individuals representing the following departments, agencies and organizations:

El Dorado County

- County Administrator's Office
- General Services Department
- Department of Transportation
- Auditor-Controller
- Risk Management
- Sheriff
- County Counsel
- Environmental Management
- Planning
- County Surveyor – GIS Division

Eldorado National Forest

- Acting District Ranger
- Forest Biologist

State Parks, Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Division

- Deputy Director

Rubicon Oversight Committee

- Four members of Committee

Superior Court of California, County of El Dorado

- Court Executive Officer and Staff

A summary of the estimated costs to implement Alternative A is shown in the table below:

Example Five-Year Program Budget

Department	Base Year 07/08	Five Year Budget Plan (assume 5% Inflation on top of 07/08)				
		FY 08/09	FY 09/10	FY 10/11	FY 11/12	FY 12/13
General Services*	\$157,659	\$165,542	\$173,819	\$182,510	\$191,635	\$201,217
DOT	88,047	92,449	97,072	101,925	107,022	112,373
Environmental Management	33,252	34,915	36,660	38,493	40,418	42,439
County Surveyor - GIS	5,325	5,591	5,871	6,164	6,473	6,796
Sheriff	132,211	138,822	145,763	153,051	160,703	168,738
SUB-TOTAL RTMP Management Program	\$416,494	\$437,319	\$459,185	\$482,144	\$506,251	\$531,564
Rubicon Trail Capital Projects		\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000
TOTAL RTMP Costs		\$637,319	\$659,185	\$682,144	\$706,251	\$731,564
* Some operating expenses do not repeat each year and are factored in calculation						

The ability of the County to fund the level of activity identified in the RTMP depends upon a combination of several factors, including:

- The continuing availability of the OHV Recreational Vehicle License In-Lieu Fee in the amount of \$132,000 beyond January 2008, now assured by the recent approval and chaptering of SB 742 – Steinberg;
- The success of the County in receiving OHV grant funding for law enforcement and trail restoration, monitoring, maintenance and construction of new facilities;
- The ability of the County to implement and collect a trail use fee from trail users to help underwrite the RTMP program; and
- The success of the County to maximize the matching of volunteer efforts with County-funded efforts to carry out maintenance and construction projects on the Trail.

Alternative B

The approach for analyzing the fiscal impacts associated with implementation of Alternative A do not apply when evaluating the Alternative B fiscal impacts, since there are no required actions

for the County to take under this Alternative. We look instead at known sources of revenue and how these known revenues can be leveraged to enable the program to be carried out to the maximum extent practicable. Under Alternative B, we are faced with a dilemma of sorts: without sufficient outside financial resources available to the County, many of the goals and objectives that are in Alternative B cannot be implemented; and without some level of investment in the basic level of program management and engineering support those outside revenues are unlikely to materialize.

We provide in the discussion on Alternative B, the estimated unit costs for differing management program components so that an understanding of how the County might develop a management program so that discrete program elements may be accomplished, albeit without addressing the entire RTMP. These estimated costs are shown in the table on the following page in their discrete increments.

Conclusions

Alternative A of the RTMP gives sufficient direction from which to undertake an analysis of fiscal impacts to the County directly related to Plan implementation. Plan implementation is likely to cost El Dorado County in excess of \$500,000 annually, with that cost increasing with inflation over time. A stable source of funding will continue (if current legislation is adopted extending the sunset provisions of current statutes) that can be put to good use as seed money to generate additional revenue to implement the full RTMP. In addition, if the County has the ability to implement a trail use fee for recreational vehicle access to the Rubicon Trail, that can become a reliable source of revenue for management as well as capital improvements on the Trail to augment all other sources of funding.

Alternative B, which calls for minimal County management of trail use, does not provide any clear direction from which to perform a fiscal analysis. Instead, one has to draw conclusions from several “What if” questions. The only real given is the presumed continuation of the In-Lieu revenue from OHV License Fees provided by the State. That amount, as identified above, has the potential as serving as seed money to be leveraged to obtain additional sources of funding. How well those limited funds from the In-Lieu fees are employed will determine how much of the RTMP can be undertaken in any given year.

Summary of Incremental Costs of RTMP

Department	Unit Cost	Estimated Expense
General Services, DAPG		\$157,659
Trail Supervisor 1.0 FTE	\$67,847	
Trail Aide 1.0 FTE for six months	\$22,250	
Accounting Support 0.20 FTE	\$11,753	
Management Overhead	\$5,859	
DAPG Operating Expenses & Equipment	\$49,950	
Department of Transportation		\$88,047
Sr. Engineering Technician	\$86,107	
Transportation Costs	\$1,940	
Environmental Management		\$33,252
Sample Collection: REHS or Haz Mat Staff	\$10,920	
Transportation Costs: Sample Collection	\$582	
Annual Report: Sr. REHS	\$1,665	
Education/Training; REHS or Haz Mat Staff	\$5,200	
Transportation Costs: Education	\$485	
Laboratory	\$14,400	
County Surveyor- GIS Division		\$5,325
GIS Analyst II @ Annual Salary/Benefits \$97,849 3 field surveys per year @ 10 hrs ea = 30 hrs Internet update 20 weeks @ 2 hrs per update = 40 hrs Design GIS data tables and upload = 40 hrs Total Annual Hours = 110 or 0.05 FTE	\$5,175	
Transportation Costs 300+ miles @ \$0.485 /mile	\$150	
Sheriff		\$132,211
Deputy Sheriff II (2 bodies @ 0.5 FTE ea to RTMP)	\$90,980	
Community Services Officers (2 bodies @ 0.5 FTE ea to RTMP)	\$37,331	
Fuel Purchases	\$3,900	
TOTAL		\$416,494

ALTERNATIVE A FISCAL IMPLICATIONS OF IMPLEMENTATION

Under its agreement with El Dorado County (County) to prepare an Environmental Impact Report evaluating the County's proposed Rubicon Trail Master Plan (RTMP), Environmental Stewardship and Planning (ESP) has prepared a fiscal analysis to assist the Board of Supervisors (Board) in its consideration of the RTMP. The purpose of this analysis is to provide the County with an evaluation of the fiscal impacts associated with implementation of the RTMP, particularly those impacts associated with implementation of Alternative "A" versus Alternative "B" of the Plan. This report is limited to an analysis of potential County costs associated with the implementation of the Plan and does not seek to serve as an economic impacts analysis of the Rubicon Trail as a factor in the economy of El Dorado County. Accordingly, this report does not address assumptions about dollars presumed spent by Rubicon Trail users within the borders of El Dorado County and how those existing and/or potential expenditures may be affected by implementation of the management strategy included in the Plan.

Alternative A represents an affirmative statement of intent on the part of the County of El Dorado to actively manage the Rubicon Trail as an off-highway recreational vehicle asset. While it is stated in the Plan that the recommendations contained therein are advisory to other agencies, including the Eldorado National Forest, the Plan is prescriptive with respect to the County's responsibilities. As such we assume for the purposes of this analysis that the tasks identified in Alternative A will be implemented; however, as will be discussed herein below, there may be differing program implementation strategies, with varying costs associated with each approach.

ESP's agreement with the County provides for an analysis of the Plan as well as conducting interviews with key individuals and agency representatives who have been particularly involved in the planning effort. Individuals interviewed in this effort include representatives of the following agencies/groups:

El Dorado County

- County Administrator's Office
- General Services Department
- Department of Transportation
- Auditor-Controller
- Risk Management
- Sheriff
- County Counsel
- Environmental Management
- Planning
- County Surveyor – GIS Division

Superior Court of California, County of El Dorado

- Court Executive Officer and Staff

Eldorado National Forest

- Acting District Ranger
- Forest Biologist

State Parks, Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Division

- Deputy Director

Rubicon Oversight Committee

- Four members of Committee

The RTMP embodies the County's intent to manage and support off-highway vehicle (OHV) use on the Trail while protecting the natural and social resources of the Rubicon Trail. The RTMP process included the development of a unified set of goals in consultation with the County, Rubicon Oversight Committee (ROC), and the public. The RTMP goals include:

Goal 1: To promote on-going community and user participation in Trail management.

Goal 2: To provide adequate facilities and suitable services to support Trail-related activities, where there is a documented need to support such activities; protect the natural, cultural and human resource values of the Rubicon Trail; and preserve the experience and quality of life in the area.

Goal 3: To preserve and enhance the unique range of experiences and historic character of the Trail.

Goal 4: To employ equity as a guiding principle when defining rights, responsibilities and obligations of ALL Trail users.

Goal 5: To achieve a balance between County-wide economic benefits, costs and impacts associated with Trail use.

Goal 6: To preserve and protect environmental and cultural resources.

Goal 7: To enhance educational programs on Trail safety and etiquette, respect for private and public lands, natural and historical resources, and Trail rules and regulations.

Goal 8: To establish the County's primary role in facilitating coordinated Trail management, in cooperation with the USFS and other resource agencies and groups.

Goal 9: To enhance safety through education, enforcement, facilities, and coordinated rescue response.

Goal 10: To promote adequate law and code enforcement to protect public health, safety, and welfare; property; and natural resources.

Achievement of these 10 goals is sought through implementation of a management strategy comprised of thirteen program elements and their concomitant objectives and actions. These thirteen elements include:

- Element 1 - Trail Management
- Element 2 - Facilities
- Element 3 - Law Enforcement Programs
- Element 4 - Educational Programs
- Element 5 - Transportation Programs
- Element 6 - Trail Maintenance and Resource Protection
- Element 7 - Agency and Community Coordination Programs
- Element 8 - Carrying Capacity
- Element 9 - Adaptive Management Strategy
- Element 10 - Trail Use Agreements and Requirements
- Element 11 - Monitoring and Reporting Programs
- Element 12 - Regulations and Ordinances
- Element 13 - Funding

Management of the Rubicon Trail

Implementation of Alternative A would require the County to actively manage the Rubicon Trail as a recreation resource. Management responsibilities include the planning, coordinating, supervising, budgeting, grant writing, reporting, providing staff support to an appointed advisory body, and interagency coordination and liaison activities with other private and governmental entities. Implementation of Alternative A would manage the quality of recreation experienced on the Trail and would work to preserve the continued availability of this important recreational asset.

Accordingly, the approach taken in this analysis does not address Unit Cost for individual activities in support of articulated goals and objectives, but instead, seeks to achieve an understanding of the major managerial costs that would be incurred by the County under implementation of “Alternative A” of the Plan. This analysis does not seek to assign specific costs to individual projects, as our experience indicates that estimates, albeit “ball park” in nature, do not always reflect the actual cost of projects, especially in remote areas such as the RTMP project area. The RTMP process relies on an ongoing monitoring and adaptive management process to identify trail maintenance and management projects that will utilize a mix of County (or contracted) resources, in combination with volunteer groups/Trail sponsors, that can design and implement specific projects for the lowest possible cost.

Who Manages the Trail?

While the use of the Rubicon Trail by recreational off-highway vehicles occurs primarily during late spring through early autumn, the management responsibilities are a year-round effort. As currently organized, the General Services Department through its Division of Airports, Parks and Grounds (DAPG) and the County Department of Transportation (DOT) have principal responsibility for management of the Rubicon Trail. The DAPG is responsible for managing the trail as a recreational asset: the DAPG has budget responsibility for planning activities, budgeting/accounting, staffing the ROC, interagency coordination, etc. DOT assumes responsibility for the Trail as a public road insofar as County resources are required to assure the integrity of the Trail as a non-maintained road. DOT provides engineering resources to evaluate Trail conditions, and to design and oversee the construction of repairs and improvements. The DAPG is the principal agency with leadership responsibility for Plan implementation and would work with DOT in a collaborative process. As those departments carry out their respective roles, the resources of other County departments are engaged. Those departments playing significant roles, primarily during the season-of-use, include the Sheriff, DEM and the County Surveyor's GIS Division. In the background, assuring adherence to County policies, are the County Administrator, County Counsel, Planning Services Department and Risk Management.

The RTMP provides for the creation of the ROC as a formal advisory body to the Board of Supervisors, as opposed to the current ad hoc status of the Committee. As articulated in the Plan it is expected that overall management of the Rubicon Trail will occur under the general guidance from the ROC, however, with budget and policy authority reserved for the Board. Success of the Plan requires strong coordination between the two principal County departments: General Services and DOT.

As discussed above, General Services assumes responsibility for the recreational program aspects of Trail use, but the responsibility of maintaining the integrity of the Trail as a public, albeit non-maintained road, falls on DOT. County Resolution 142-89 asserts that the Rubicon Trail and its variants is a public road, and the subsequent conveyance of a right-of-way from the U.S. Forest Service to the County known as the Ellis Creek Intertie, suggest the applicability of Title 12 of the County's Codes as it pertains to Streets, Sidewalks and Public Places. Accordingly, the County is asserting authority over the road, and therefore, the County assumes a responsibility for it as well.

As outlined in Alternative A of the Plan, the various activities associated with management of the Rubicon Trail as a recreation asset include:

- Staff support to the Rubicon Oversight Committee;
- Coordinate Volunteer efforts;
- Coordinate and facilitate the execution of "Adopt-a-Trail" agreements with willing groups and individuals;
- Manage Rubicon Trail facility development projects;
- Implement and oversee Rubicon Trail Educational Programs;

- Compile information and prepare detailed analyses and reports on Trail usage patterns and coordinate the distribution of this information for inclusion within the County-maintained Geographic Information System (GIS) database for the Rubicon Trail;
- Collect, assemble, and distribute monitoring reports from various County departments and agencies including County Sheriff's Department, DEM, DOT, and DAPG;
- Update and maintain the Rubicon Trail Use Agreement (TUA) system;
- Maintain an adequate level of supplies including RubiCans, RubiKits, Rubicon Trail Atlases and all other necessary materials;
- Prepare annual monitoring reports for consideration and use by the ROC, the Parks and Recreation Commission, the Board of Supervisors and other purposes;
- Perform pre-season and post-season reviews of trail conditions in association with the ROC;
- Prepare a report of pre- and post-season trail conditions observed and recommendations on applicable recommendations;
- Prepare and maintain a list of restoration projects proposed for Trail maintenance that would be updated on an annual basis (DOT approval is required for all significant trail maintenance projects);
- Coordinate with volunteer groups to schedule restoration projects; and
- Coordinate with the County GIS staff to compile geographic data for restoration and trail maintenance locations.

General Services Staffing and Support

The level of staffing assumed in this analysis included the following:

Dedicated Positions	FTE¹
Trail Supervisor (not yet classified)	1.0
Trail Aide (Extra Help)	1.0
Departmental Support/Chargeback	
DAPG Manager	0.05
Accounting Support/Fiscal Asst. II	0.20

The Trail Supervisor, working under the direction of the DAPG manager, is calculated at the same level as the currently classified River Recreation Supervisor, while the Trail Aide is

¹ FTE = Full-Time Equivalent

calculated at the same level as the current River Recreation Aide. While the Trail Supervisor is proposed as a full-time regular position to provide direct management for the program on a year around basis, the Trail Aide is reflected as 2.0 half-time positions (six months employment each) and as extra help positions with no employment benefits. It is certainly appropriate to expect that over time the Trail Supervisor may assume a broader departmental role than solely being involved with the Rubicon Trail; however, we believe the Plan implementation is sufficiently complex to require the full-time attention of this position during the first two years.

Overall direction to the Trail Supervisor is provided by the DAPG Manager, who during a recent 12-month period has devoted approximately 5 percent of his time to the Rubicon Trail program. It is reasonable to expect that this will be the minimum level of involvement by the DAPG Manager. Accounting support from the Department is expected to peak during the actual Trail use season – May through September/October – when it is proposed that fees associated with TUAs will be collected. Year-round accountability for grant funds will also require accounting support from the Department. During the interview process, the Department has suggested and we concur that the year-round accounting support will average out to approximately 0.20 FTE staff.

Operations

Without attributing direct costs to trail maintenance, restoration projects or construction of capital facilities, the General Services Department is expected to incur costs in a few expenditure categories including replacement of disposable supplies, printing of maps and other informational materials related to use of the Trail, small tools and instrument items including radios/satellite phones and GPS units, professional services from other County departments or outside contracted parties, transportation-related costs (personal mileage reimbursement, County vehicle use, fuel purchases) and all terrain vehicles capable of negotiating the Trail used in the performance of Trail inspections, collecting laboratory samples, etc.

Expenditure Categories

Services and Supplies - The array of expenditures expected to be required in the Services and Supplies category include refuse disposal, photocopying/printing charges, Trail kits (RubiCans/RubiKits), laboratory services not otherwise covered by DEM-contracted services, minor telephone and radio equipment, private auto mileage reimbursement and/or County fleet vehicle charges and fuel purchases.

Total Services and Supplies Estimate – Annual: \$29,950

Capital Expenditures - This analysis assumes the purchase of one or more small off-highway articulating vehicle or ATV either as a replacement or new for the uses indicated in the Plan (Trail inspection, sample collection, gathering GPS coordinates, enforcing Trail rules, etc.).

Total Capital Expenditures Estimate - First Year: \$20,000
(Equipment replaced as wears out)

Estimated Annual Funding Requirements

For the purposes of this fiscal analysis we are assuming the establishment of a dedicated Special Revenue Fund used solely for the purpose of budgeting and accounting for the funds appropriated and expended on behalf of the Rubicon Trail Off-Highway Recreation facility. While not absolutely required under the State Controller's Accounting Guidelines for counties, in discussions with both the County Administrator and Auditor-Controller's offices, both agree that given the amount of funds expected to be available for the County's off-highway vehicle program and the accounting requirements associated with the sources of funds for the program, a dedicated fund would be appropriate. Whether the County prepares a full line-item budget or chooses to make all expenditures through a single Operating Transfers-Out line item with the operating departments reflecting revenue via the operating Transfers-In account, in the following table, we have provided below an estimate of the annual costs associated with implementation of Alternative A.

Principal Managing Department – General Services

Estimated Annual Costs – General Services (Using FY 2007-08 Salary Schedule)

Position/Item	FTE	Annual Cost to Program
Personnel Costs		
DAPG-Direct Costs		
Trail Supervisor (See River Recreation Supervisor)	1.0	\$67,847
Trail Aide (See River Recreation Aide Extra Help) 2 ea. for 6 months	1.0	\$22,250
DAPG-Indirect Support		
DAPG Manager	0.05	\$5,859
Accounting/Clerical (Fiscal Asst. II) (5 X 5 months)	0.20	\$11,753
Operating Costs		
Services and Supplies	Various	\$29,950
Capital Expenditures	Equipment	\$20,000
Estimated Annual Costs G.S. - TOTAL		\$157,659

Other Financing Uses – Operating Transfers Out - The method by which inter-fund expenditures and revenues are recorded is through the use of the Operating Transfers accounting category. By implementing this method, expenditures and offsetting revenues are not double

counted, which would otherwise inflate the County's budget. For the purposes of this analysis, the following departments are expected to seek appropriations on the basis of and post charges against a budget established under a Special Revenue Fund dedicated to the Rubicon Trail Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation program:

- Department of Transportation
- Environmental Management
- County Surveyor- GIS
- Sheriff

Other Departments' Detail

Department of Transportation Role and Resource Commitment

DOT's role in issues pertaining to the Trail includes an array of responsibilities, including but not limited to the following:

- Maintenance of County-maintained roads that serve as access routes to the Rubicon Trail;
- Installation and maintenance of signage along those county access roads;
- Installation and maintenance of signage and physical barriers that mark the official Rubicon Trail and its variants;
- Assessing the condition of the Trail and preparing an annual work program for restoration of damaged areas along the Trail;
- Preparing the project specifications for restoration projects, including engineering; preparing bid documents where indicated; and carrying out or overseeing the construction of improvements along the Trail;
- Assuring compliance with CEQA and NEPA for any County initiated project along the Trail that is subject to the provisions of either Act;
- Assure compliance with applicable county codes pertaining to use of public roads;
- Coordinate the implementation of erosion/sedimentation control and drainage improvement projects to divert water away from the Rubicon Trail at key areas to minimize ponding, erosion, gully formation, and resultant sedimentation and water quality degradation; and
- Identify and design stream approach and crossing projects to protect stream and fishery resources and prevent sedimentation and water quality degradation in area streams and receiving waters.

DOT's responsibilities include County-maintained roads that access the Rubicon Trail (e.g., Wentworth Springs Road from Georgetown and Ice House Road from U.S. Highway 50).

For the purposes of this analysis, the resource commitment from DOT specific to Plan implementation is primarily in the area of engineering support. Where County road crews, material and County equipment are used in construction and maintenance projects, those project specific costs will be estimated up front and will become part of the project costs. Also, project specific engineering costs should be charged back to the specific project. Costs associated with Alternative A Plan implementation and not otherwise supported include the more general assessment of the trail, preparation of preliminary estimates of cost and preparation of the annual work program and onsite coordination of volunteer groups/Trail sponsors repair and maintenance efforts.

The level of staffing recommended by DOT for the level of activity described herein, and we concur, includes:

Position	FTE
Senior Engineering Technician	1.0

DOT assumes that the one full-time equivalent Senior Engineering Technician will consist of two or more incumbents carrying out assignments benefitting the Trail. No one position is expected to be assigned to the tasks associated with the Trail.

**Estimated Annual Costs – DOT
(Using FY 2007-08 Salary Schedule)**

Position/Item	FTE	Annual Cost to Program
Sr. Engineering Technician	1.0	\$86,107
Transportation Costs		\$1,940
TOTAL		\$88,047

Environmental Management

DEM's primary role in the management of the Rubicon Trail is focused on the area of resource monitoring. Water quality concerns resulting from illegal and improper disposal of human-generated wastes and contamination of trail and off-site soils resulting from petroleum product spills from vehicles require the attention of Environmental Management. Some of DEM's responsibilities listed in the Plan are part and parcel of its responsibilities to enforce the health and safety laws of the State and the County. Accordingly, the costs related to these public health services are generally attributable to either fees generated from food facility permits (in the case of commercial trail outfitters who provide food as part of their services) or other applicable permits. Where DEM is undertaking a specific set of tasks in support of implementing the RTMP, fees paid by others for specific permits cannot cover the costs associated with such tasks. It would be expected that costs for services rendered in support of the RTMP would be covered by the Rubicon Trail program.

The RTMP identifies an array of tasks presumed to be implemented by DEM or by contracted professional services. We are assuming for this exercise that the services will be carried out by DEM. Some of these responsibilities articulated in the plan include:

- Sampling watersheds potentially affected by activities on the Trail and Trail soils for potential contaminants as well as producing annual reports;
- Sampling will be done prior to and following each summer season, prior to and following high-use days (holidays and special events), and following rainfall events (to check for runoff contaminants);
- Investigate potential sources of contamination and develop avoidance/mitigation measures in response to monitoring results and coordinate these results with responsible agencies to ensure compliance with applicable state and federal laws;
- Track all sampling points and contamination areas using Geographic Position System (GPS) technology. This information will be reported to the County GIS staff and included in an annual report;
- In cooperation with the USFS, will identify appropriate locations and technologies for additional toilet facilities along the Trail;
- Participate in training of volunteer for distributing trail information and educating users on “Tread Lightly!” trail etiquette, “pack it in, pack it out” program and other user requirements/prohibitions; and
- Maintain a listing of water quality issues, identified through water sampling and monitoring, and identification of results which indicate the need for increased water resources protection actions through physical modifications to the Trail or adjacent areas or indicate the need for regulatory management actions.

Estimated Annual Costs – Environmental Management

Position/Item	Rate/Hr	Estimated Hours	Annual Cost to Program
Sample Collection: REHS or Haz Mat Staff	\$65*	168	\$10,920
Transportation Costs: Sample Collection			\$582
Annual Report: Sr. REHS	\$65	16	\$1,665
Education/Training: REHS or Haz Mat Staff	\$65	80	\$5,200
Transportation Costs: Education			\$485
Laboratory	\$40/sample	360 samples	\$14,400
TOTAL			\$33,252
* \$65 per hour is the rate charged for State Grants			

County Surveyor-GIS Division

Under Alternative A of the Plan, the County Surveyor's GIS Division's responsibilities include dissemination of the information provided from Trail inspection and project activity into the County's Geographic Information System program. By logging information specific to locations along the Trail, data becomes available for a variety of management needs. Based upon the number of inspections expected to occur under the RTMP the County Surveyor has provided an estimate of the resource requirement for that office to accommodate the proposed level of use of the County GIS program. The estimate provided does not include other management tools that might be desired, such as maintaining a progress log for every restoration, construction or maintenance project along the Trail. DOT maintains its own project record; however, the County Surveyor did indicate a willingness to work with DOT on making the GIS available for additional levels of work.

Estimated Annual Costs – County Surveyor-GIS (Using FY 2007-08 Salary Schedule)

Position/Item	FTE	Annual Cost to Program
Assumes the following:		
GIS Analyst II @ Annual Salary/Benefits \$97,849	0.05	\$5,175
3 field surveys per year @ 10 hrs ea = 30 hrs		
Internet update 20 weeks @ 2 hrs per update = 40 hrs		
Design GIS data tables and upload = 40 hrs		
Total Annual Hours = 110 or 0.05 FTE		
Transportation Costs 300+ miles @ \$0.485 /mile		\$150
TOTAL		\$5,325

Sheriff

The Law Enforcement Element of the RTMP provides for no specific level of Sheriff involvement. While the actual Plan element directed to the law enforcement contains only minimal guidance regarding law enforcement activity level, as evidenced in the Plan excerpt below, threaded throughout the Plan is an expectation that enforcement of State and local laws will occur, including such things as parking along Ice House Road; enforcement of the California Vehicle Code (CVC) on the Trail; issuance of citations and prosecution of crimes resulting in fine and penalty assessment revenue becoming available to the benefit of the Trail, etc.

RTMP Element #3 – Law Enforcement provides:

- As resources permit the El Dorado County Sheriff's Office will patrol the Rubicon Trail as needed to maintain law and order. These patrols may be conducted in coordination with other law enforcement agencies, and civic groups who have volunteered to aid law enforcement in identifying and reporting activity. Patrols of the Rubicon Trail will be contingent upon the availability of OHV trained sheriff's personnel, and the operational condition of OHV vehicles and equipment.
- To the extent resources permit, the El Dorado County Sheriff's Office may develop incident reports with recordation of locations of these incidents via geographic positioning systems (GPS); and prepare a post-season annual report summarizing activities throughout the season and presenting the report and recommendations to the Rubicon Oversight Committee (ROC).

Discussions with representatives of various agencies and interested groups, including the Sheriff, suggest the need for a positive local law enforcement presence along and in the vicinity of the Trail. The Eldorado National Forest has Law Enforcement Officer (LEO) and Forest Protection Officer (FPO) positions allocated to the area, but the principal role of these positions is enforcement of federal laws within the national forest. The Rubicon Trail does pass through federally owned lands within the national forest; however, a significant portion of the Trail also passes through private property outside the jurisdiction of the Forest Service.

The Sheriff's Department has identified what it believes is a reasonable staffing mix for the Rubicon Trail. The level of law enforcement presence provided by the Sheriff would be complementary to the law enforcement presence in the area provided by the Eldorado National Forest. Staffing for the Rubicon Trail being recommended by the Sheriff includes:

- 2.0 Deputy Sheriff positions (assume at DS II @ mid range) committed to the Rubicon beat five days per week, six months per year.
- 2.0 Community Service Officers, Extra Help status, committed to the Rubicon beat five days per week, six months per year. These positions do not have peace officer status and cannot issue citations but can prepare reports and if a violation is considered significant, file a report with the District Attorney to press charges. The CSO would serve at the Trail Head and assure that permits (TUAs) have been obtained, the vehicle is compliant with CVC and posted Rubicon requirements, RubiKits or equivalent are in the vehicle and the Trail users understand the rules of the Trail.

**Estimated Annual Costs – County Sheriff
(Using FY 2007-08 Salary Schedule)**

Position/Item	FTE	Annual Cost to Program
Assumes the following: Deputy Sheriff II (2 bodies @ 0.5 FTE each to RTMP)	1.0	\$90,980
Community Services Officers (2 bodies @ 0.5 FTE each to RTMP)	1.0	\$37,331
Fuel Purchases:		\$3,900
Assume 100 mile round trip Placerville to Trailhead and return plus 20 miles of Trail patrol =15,600 mi/year		
Assume average mileage in MPG	10.00	
Assume Fuel Cost per gallon	\$2.50	
Assume cost per mile	\$0.25	
TOTAL		\$132,211

An important limitation of the Sheriff's commitment is the availability of financial support for the two Deputy Sheriff positions assigned to the Rubicon Trail during the peak (summer) season. Realistically, the Sheriff cannot recruit for and retain seasonal positions for fully trained and certified peace officers for the fall and winter of each year. Funding the positions above from Rubicon monies or from Law Enforcement Grants from the State Parks Off-Highway Recreational Vehicle Funds for half of the year still requires funding for the Deputy Sheriff's for the remainder of the year from another source. The CSOs can be seasonal extra help but Deputies need to come from the ranks and have other assignments throughout the year.

Total Estimated Cost of Program

The Table below summarizes the costs associated with the County's management responsibilities. It is important to reiterate our comments in the section above titled **Management of the Rubicon Trail**: "...the approach taken in this analysis...seeks to achieve an understanding of the major managerial costs that would be incurred by the County under implementation of "Alternative A" of the Plan. We do not seek to put price tags on individual projects...". Accordingly, we have not attempted to estimate the cost of restoring segments of the Trail, the cost of material, equipment and manpower to maintain the Trail, or the cost to construct new facilities that may be contemplated for the Trail.

Summary of Expenses

Department	Estimated Expense
General Services, DAPG	\$157,659
Department of Transportation	\$88,047
Environmental Management	\$33,252
County Surveyor- GIS Division	\$5,325
Sheriff	\$132,211
TOTAL	\$416,494

Program Cost Reduction Considerations

It is significant to note that staff salaries and benefits account for approximately 83 percent of the total estimated annual cost for managing the Rubicon Trail under implementation of Alternative A of the RTMP. Consequently, any attempt to create economies or substantially reduce the overall cost of the management program must be concentrated on staff commitment to the program or by foregoing implementation of many of the Plan actions identified as important to achieving the articulated goals and objectives.

The program costs reflected in the Summary Table above are based upon the assumptions that certain departments would have discreet responsibility for specified activities. For example, we have assumed that Environmental Management staff would perform the collection of water and soil samples at an estimated cost of \$11,502, an amount covering both staff time and transportation costs to and from the Rubicon Trail from Placerville. This amount could be trimmed from the total by training the Trail Aides to perform this function. The Trail Aides will be in the area each day on regular assignment, and the costs associated with the Trail Aides' services would be equivalent to the time and materials needed to collect the water and soil samples from the designated locations. Another potential increment of savings would be to employ the Extra Help Trail Aides and Community Services Officers for five (5) month instead of the six months reflected above.

We would hesitate to recommend forgoing the use of the County's GIS capability. The expenditure estimate for the GIS component itself - \$5,325 – amounts only to approximately 1 percent of the total program and yields many management benefits over time directly to the Rubicon Trail. The costs for establishing GPS coordinates involves other department's staff; however, it is assumed that the inputting of GPS coordinates would normally occur during routine and special inspections of the Trail and not create an additional burden on staff performing these inspections.

Deleting the purchase of equipment in the first years after Plan implementation assumes the availability of serviceable equipment to enable regular access to the Trail for condition

inspections, water and soil sample collection, etc. We make the assumption, however, that eventually, replacement of all terrain or articulating vehicles will be required to assure access to the Trail as required in the Plan.

During the first few years following RTMP implementation we believe it important to continue to budget for the 1.0 FTE Sr. Engineering Technician support in DOT. While the level of effort may not be required in out-years, the ability of the County to quantify the level of restoration and maintenance effort required on the Trail during the first few years is heavily reliant upon DOT's involvement in assessing the condition of the Trail and "engineering" the various projects. Estimates of materials required, equipment needed to accomplish the tasks and potential mix of County and volunteer labor to accomplish the tasks are required to understand the costs of the projects. This understanding is essential for the County to be able to submit grant applications to the State Parks OHV program and other granting entities. To be able to justify the establishment of any Trail Use Fee program, the County must be able to show that the fees are predicated upon the cost to deliver the service; in this case the continuing availability of the Rubicon Trail to off-highway recreational vehicle enthusiasts.

Examples of Potential Cost Reductions

Cost Factor	Assumed in Cost Estimate	Reduction Estimate	Change (+/-)
Reduce Trail Aides from 6 months to 5 months	\$22,250	\$17,800	(\$4,450)
Reduce CSOs from 6 months to 5 months	\$37,331	\$29,865	(\$7,466)
Trail Aides perform water and soil sample collection instead of Environmental Management personnel	\$11,502	\$0	(\$11,502)
Delete Capital Expenditure for Articulating Vehicle/ATV	\$20,000	\$0	(\$20,000)
Total Program	\$416,494	\$373,076	(\$43,418)

It would be our recommendation that the involvement of the engineering staff of DOT in the first year be concentrated on the development of a five-year capital improvement plan for the Rubicon Trail. The five-year plan would help the County establish a long-term budget strategy for the Rubicon Trail, provide the basis for grant applications and support the County's establishment of a Trail Use Fee. For the sake of preparing a sample five-year budget we will assume that DOT will identify a total of \$1 million in combined Trail restoration, maintenance, improvement and other capital facility construction with an average annual expenditure requirement of \$200,000. This is an over simplification of real world budgeting; however, the purpose here is to illustrate how the County might approach managing the Rubicon Trail with numbers that are not stray too far from what is expected to be needed to perform under Alternative A.

In the next section we will examine the revenue side of the equation.

Example Five-Year Program Budget

Department	Base Year 07/08	Five Year Budget Plan Assume 5% Inflation on top of 07/08				
		FY 08/09	FY 09/10	FY 10/11	FY 11/12	FY 12/13
General Services*	\$157,659	\$165,542	\$173,819	\$182,510	\$191,635	\$201,217
DOT	\$88,047	\$92,449	\$97,072	\$101,925	\$107,022	\$112,373
Environmental Management	\$33,252	\$34,915	\$36,660	\$38,493	\$40,418	\$42,439
County Surveyor- GIS	\$5,325	\$5,591	\$5,871	\$6,164	\$6,473	\$6,796
Sheriff	\$132,211	\$138,822	\$145,763	\$153,051	\$160,703	\$168,738
SUB-TOTAL RTMP Management Program	\$416,494	\$437,319	\$459,185	\$482,144	\$506,251	\$531,564
Rubicon Trail Capital Projects		\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000
TOTAL RTMP Costs		\$637,319	\$659,185	\$682,144	\$706,251	\$731,564

* Some operating expenses do not repeat each year and are factored in calculation

Program Revenue

Element 13 of the Plan addresses RTMP funding. The Plan anticipates full implementation, which would include trail maintenance and construction of needed facilities. Implementation of maintenance and construction activities would require the combined allocation of user fees, fines, grants funding, donations and volunteer efforts. The specific Plan activities that speak to this issue include:

- The County will establish a Rubicon Trust Fund in which all fees, fines and other funding derived from the Rubicon Trail program be deposited for the sole purpose of funding the implementation and on-going operation and maintenance of the Trail.
- The ROC will review TUA fees and recommend adjustments as necessary on an annual basis to ensure that fees remain in balance with program costs.
- The County will adopt necessary ordinances to establish fines for infractions identified within the Master Plan related to parking, failure to obtain TUAs, illegal camping, damage to the trail and/or environment, dumping, failure to comply with commercial regulations, failure to comply with sanitary requirements and any other violation of state or federal law. Fees generated from such ordinances will be directed to the Rubicon Trust Fund for the sole purpose of funding the implementation and on-going operation and maintenance of the Trail.

- The County will seek funding annually through Federal and State grant programs.
- The County will increase coordination efforts with the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to identify possible federal funding sources for OHV resources.
- The County will explore opportunities for additional availability of funding sources through grants which may be available for OHV resources as well as those which may be available in association with resources protection and restoration activities, roadway or transportation improvement projects, and other potential sources.
- The County will coordinate with various Trail user groups for possible volunteer labor and donation of supplies to be used to build facilities and to assist with on-going operation and maintenance of the trail and associated facilities.
- The County will actively seek financial assistance or the donation of equipment, construction materials and/or other items from large corporate sponsors, non-profit organizations and businesses with interest in the Trail.

Trust Fund vs. Special Revenue Fund

We have recommended above that the County establish a Special Revenue Fund, rather than a trust fund, through which to carry out the budget and accounting activities in support of the RTMP. Under the accounting guidelines set forth by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB), as well as the budgeting guidelines maintained by the State Controller's Office (Accounting Standards and Procedures for Counties), where revenues are used in support of appropriations for expenditures they should be included in one of two governmental funds, either the general fund or a special revenue fund. While it is not mandated that revenue and expenditures for the Rubicon Trail be segregated into a fund separate from the general fund, by doing so, financial information on the revenue and expenditure activity of the programs become more readily available to staff and the public. Such separation would also facilitate financial reporting to grantors as may be required by conditions of various public agency as well as private foundation grants.

New Ordinances Establishing Fines and Fine Revenue

Element 13 recommends the adoption of new ordinances that will a) establish fines related to the violations along the Trail; and b) funnel all such fine revenue to the exclusive benefit of the Rubicon Trail management program. In reviewing the existing County Code sections that are pertinent to the issues raised in the RTMP, i.e., Title 10 Vehicles and Traffic, and Title 12 Streets, Sidewalks and Public Places, we believe the County already possesses significant legal authority to issue citations and charge criminal offense.

- Title 10 provides that violation of that title shall constitute an infraction and shall be punishable in accordance with the California Vehicle Code sections 42001 and 42001.5 which generally provide that penalty for 1st offense to be \$100; 2nd offense within one year \$200; a 3rd offense within that same year would expose the offender to a \$250 fine. (see 10.04.060 Penalty for Violation);

- Title 12 provides that a violation of that title shall constitute a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not to exceed five hundred dollars (\$500) or by imprisonment in the County jail for a term not to exceed six (6) months or by both such fine and imprisonment (see 12.56.060 Penalty for Violation)

With respect to the recommendation contained within the plan to direct all such collected by the County (i.e., those fines that would otherwise be directed to the County Treasury via its General Fund and become part of the pool of discretionary revenue available to the Board), adoption of such a fine collection policy is certainly within the purview of the Board of Supervisors to adopt such a policy. If such a policy is adopted, upon the regular transmittal of applicable fine revenue from the Court to the County, the Auditor-Controller would simply deposit the monies into the Rubicon Trail Special Revenue Fund as cash received.

Through adoption of such a policy, however, the Board would establish a precedent and should be expected to receive requests from other areas or programs of the County to apply all fine revenue resulting from citations issued or prosecutions successfully carried out for violations that occur in these other areas. The issuer of the citations and prosecutor of criminal activity, the County Sheriff and District Attorney respectively, would likely make the argument that their offices should be the direct recipients of the revenue collected by the County because of their staff's efforts. The same argument is often heard during budget hearings from County Recorders, who because of the nature of that office typically brings in more revenue than the cost of the office.

The reality is that fine revenue actually received rarely equals the cost of the effort to enforce, let alone prosecute, the very laws that had been violated. The exception to this rule has generally been those high profile environmental or consumer crimes that result in very large fines or settlement agreements. In these latter cases we have seen large amounts of fine revenue directed by the Board of Supervisors (or the Court) to specific County programs that are devoted to environmental issues or to programs such as consumer protection services to benefit the interests in the community that were directly affected by the original violation.

The County Budget Act provides the Board the ability to appropriate discretionary funds from the County General Fund to underwrite programs, whether they be used for law enforcement or recreation. By tracking the amount of revenue accruing to the General Fund from fines attributable to citations and prosecutions of law violation in the Rubicon Trail area, an argument can be made, each budget year, for County support for the Rubicon Trail program. Accordingly, we recommend that the County not consider fine revenue a realistic source of support for Rubicon Trail needs.

Grants from OHV Sources

Prior to the enactment in 2004 of AB 2666 El Dorado County received a fairly insignificant share of the State's Off-Highway Vehicle License Fee, amounting to less than \$5,400 annually. With AB 2666, however, in FY 2006-07 El Dorado County's share of funds from this source has jumped to more than \$132,000 annually. Legislation passed during the recent legislative session and recently signed by the Governor – SB 742 (Steinberg) - repeals the January 2008 sunset provisions for the Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Act, and re-establishes the sunset for

the Act to January 2013. In addition, as chaptered SB 742 will continue to allocate to counties a share of the license fees in a manner essentially the same as was adjusted under AB 2666. This means that El Dorado County can be fairly certain of receiving approximately \$132,000 in each of the next five years, assuming of course, that the base revenue available for distribution by the State does not diminish.

Under the new legislation, counties will continue to be eligible for grants from the California Department of Parks and Recreation, Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Division to address law enforcement, trail restoration, trail acquisition, trail management, maintenance and conservation needs. Grants received from the State remain subject to the 25 percent local match provision; however, the enacted legislation continues to allow that match to be made up from both “equivalent value of services or material used” as well as local cash match. The County’s approach embodied in the RTMP, to maximize the use of volunteers to carry-out maintenance, restoration and improvements on the Rubicon Trail will help stretch available grant dollars to their fullest by recording this soft match to meet the matching requirements of a grant.

As discussed above, the availability of a five-year financial plan and a five-year capital improvement plan for the Rubicon Trail would give the County an advantage in preparing and being competitive for state grants and private foundation grants.

TUA Fees

Without commenting on the County’s statutory authority to establish a trail user fee or TUA Fee², we recommend that the calculation of the fee be predicated not on an annual need only but primarily on the basis of a five year capital improvement program and a five-year financial plan that is built on the combination of the costs to implement and continue to carry out the management of the Trail. In addition to the requirement that a fee for a County service be based upon a discernable nexus between the fee and the cost of service, any fee considered by the Board for adoption must be one that is generally accepted as reasonable; otherwise the Trail will see fewer users and fewer fees will be collected.

In our interviews with agency representatives and OHV enthusiasts, all supported the idea of charging a fee for use of the Trail, in-so-far as those fees directly support the activities of the County in managing and maintaining the Trail. The argument for a separate Special Revenue Fund is also tied to the establishment of a trail use fee, where the path of the fees collected can be clearly traced to the Rubicon budget. Based on the interviews with the agency representatives and OHV enthusiasts, there was general agreement that the amount of the fee ought not to exceed \$100 for an annual season pass, and that less than \$50 for that same pass would be too low. Some representative season pass fees for information include:

- Locally, Sly Park’s annual permit is \$90
- State Parks OHV Use Day Pass - Annual \$50

² Based on informal communication with Deputy County Counsel Ed Knapp, the Office of County Counsel does not believe the County has the authority to unilaterally impose a user fee for recreational use of the Rubicon Trail, which has been deemed a public road. Knapp suggests that action by the Legislature to amend current law designating the Rubicon Trail as a toll road may be necessary to enable the County to impose such a fee as described in the RTMP.

- Dumont Dunes (BLM) Baker Ca \$60 season pass
- Imperial Sand Dunes (BLM) \$90 season pass
- Little Sahara (BLM) Utah \$75 season pass

As we have discussed above, any consideration of user fees has to consider the cost of service as the nexus to setting the fee. The other consideration is the expected number of paying visitors each year that provides the basis for revenue projections. In the case of the Rubicon Trail, we have estimates of 30,000 to 35,000 persons a year travelling along the Trail. One short-duration traffic study identified an average of just under two persons per vehicle. The one thing we do not have good information on is how many of those 30,000 visitors are multiple repeat-visitors each year. Anecdotally, we hear from OHV enthusiasts who consider themselves “regulars” on the Rubicon Trail, that it is not unusual for some to go as many as 5-6 times during the season. For the purposes of a “wet thumb” fee generation model, we make some admittedly arbitrary assumptions, but for the sake of illustrating the problem we undertake the following analysis:

Assumptions:

- The County issues both single-trip and season passes³;
- If 30,000 visitors travel the Rubicon Trail each year; and
- There are on average two persons per vehicle; then
- 15,000 vehicles per year travel the Trail.

Further:

- If 50 percent are single-trips-per-year visitors (7,500 vehicles) the number of single-trip passes sought would be 7,500; and
- If 50 percent are multiple-trips-per-vehicle visitors (7,500 vehicles) and the average number of trips from this group is three per year, then the number of season passes requested would be 2,500 (7,500/3); and
- The total number of passes issued annually would be 10,000 (7,500 + 2,500); and
- The value of the season pass must be less than the multiple for the single-trip pass for it to be worth buying, and since we have posited the average number of multiple-trips per year to be three, then the value of the season pass needs to be less than three times the single trip pass (and still less than \$100 to be widely accepted).

In the example below, we learn that we need to raise \$425,000 for the ensuing fiscal year. Keeping with our current assumptions about the number of visitors and the desire to maintain a relationship between the single-use fee and the season pass fee, we would establish the single-use fee at \$30 and the season pass fee at \$80. The single-use pass would generate \$225,000, while the season-pass would generate \$200,000 for the desired total of \$425,000. Of course, future traffic counts and interviews with trail visitors will give a more accurate picture of the

³ We recommend issuing both day use and season passes. Only by also issuing day use passes can one truly regulate the number of vehicles on the Trail at any time.

number of multiple-trips per year visitors and the average number of those trips, upon which to base a more reliable fee structure.

Assume:	Fee		
30,000 persons per year on trail			
Average 2.0 persons per vehicle = 15, 000 vehicle trips/year			
If 50% are single trips per year users, and	7,500	\$30.00	\$225,000
50% are multiple trips by same vehicle per year.	7,500		
If the average number of trips from this group is three per year, then			
7500/3 = number of season passes desired	2,500	\$80.00	\$200,000
Total TUA Pass Revenue			\$425,000

Expense/Revenue Summary

We have seen from the discussion above that we can expect full implementation of the RTMP as envisioned in Alternative A to cost an estimated \$637,000 in FY 2008/09 to approximately \$731,000 in FY 2012/13. With a regular revenue source in the amount of \$132,000 from the Off-Highway Vehicle Licensing In-Lieu Fee and aggressive application for Grants from the State Parks and Recreation Department's Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation program for both the law enforcement element and the maintenance and capital projects elements, the burden that might be placed upon TUA fees would be considerably reduced. We have not calculated any in-kind contributions of material, equipment or labor in these numbers and have presumed a hard cash match to State grants.

In the table below we seek to illustrate how expenditures may be offset by program revenues and how the balance of uncovered costs can be the basis for setting TUA fees for use of the Trail. Realistically, if the five-year plan is developed the fees would be predicated upon assumptions over the entire period so that wild fluctuations in the TUA fee would not be experienced from year to year.

Example Five-Year Expenditure/Revenue Plan

Department	Base Year 07/08	Five Year Budget Plan Assume 5% Inflation on top of 07/08				
		FY 08/09	FY 09/10	FY 10/11	FY 11/12	FY 12/13
SUB-TOTAL RTMP Management Program	\$416,494	\$437,319	\$459,185	\$482,144	\$506,251	\$531,564
Rubicon Trail Capital Projects		\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000
TOTAL RTMP Costs		\$637,319	\$659,185	\$682,144	\$706,251	\$731,564
Revenue:						
OHV In Lieu Fees per VC 38240 (AB 2666)	\$132,750	\$132,750	\$132,750	\$132,750	\$132,750	\$132,750
OHV Law Enforcement Grants @ 75% (25% County Match)		\$104,116	\$109,322	\$114,788	\$120,527	\$126,554
OHV Restoration and other Grants @ 75% (25 County Match)		\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000
SUB-TOTAL RTMP Revenue		\$386,866	\$392,072	\$397,538	\$403,277	\$409,304
Balance Required from TUA Fees		\$250,453*	\$267,113	\$284,606	\$302,974	\$322,260
* In FY 2008/2009 Single-Use and Season Pass Fees would be \$20 and \$50 respectively under this scenario and the fee formula above.						

ALTERNATIVE B

In contrast to Alternative A, the RTMP Alternative B makes no specific demands upon the County with respect to management of the Rubicon Trail. Where Alternative A represents a prescriptive statement of what the County will do, Alternative B constitutes a permissive statement of what the County may wish to consider doing, insofar as the financial resources are available to carry them out. Another difference between the two alternatives is that Alternative B consists of only eleven elements, as opposed to the thirteen elements contained in the other alternative.

The approaches taken in analyzing the fiscal impacts associated with implementation of Alternative A do not apply in this case, since there are no required actions for the County to implement in Alternative B. Instead, we are faced with a dilemma of sorts: without sufficient outside financial resources available to the County, many of the goals and objectives that are in Alternative B cannot be implemented; and without some level of investment in the basic level of program management and engineering support under Alternative B those outside revenues are unlikely to materialize.

Known Revenues

Under either Alternative A or B, El Dorado County will continue to be the recipient of the OHV licensing in-lieu fees in the amount of approximately \$132,000 annually. This amount of stable revenue would be sufficient to fund several individual elements of the RTMP, but not the Plan as a whole. The table below carries forward the component costs from Alternative A, with the understanding that the costs were presumed to be sufficient to carry out each task to the fullest. A reduction in the level of effort would result in a concomitant reduction in cost; however, the efficacy of the effort may be more severely reduced.

When reviewing the estimated program costs above one can envision potential cutbacks, but potential problems are apparent as well; for example:

- The County can fund most of the DAPG costs, yet there are no funds left for DOT Engineering;
- The entire amount can be spent on law enforcement, however in doing so no effort is made to educate the trail users on the many concerns that have been identified in the RTMP;
- The DOT and DEM's trail monitoring functions could be funded, but there are no funds left to provide staff support to the ROC (if there is one), or law enforcement;
- Without some financial support for the Trail Supervisor and Engineering, the ability of the County to successfully compete for OHV grants is severely diminished, if not eliminated altogether as well as the ability to justify collection of any fee for trail use;
- Without committing to accounting support, proper audit trails for grant requirements will not be met and future funding from grants jeopardized.

Department	Unit Cost	Estimated Expense
General Services, DAPG		\$157,659
Trail Supervisor 1.0 FTE	\$67,847	
Trail Aide 1.0 FTE for six months	\$22,250	
Accounting Support 0.20 FTE	\$11,753	
Management Overhead	\$5,859	
DAPG Operating Expenses & Equipment	\$49,950	
Department of Transportation		\$88,047
Sr. Engineering Technician	\$86,107	
Transportation Costs	\$1,940	
Environmental Management		\$33,252
Sample Collection: REHS or Haz Mat Staff	\$10,920	
Transportation Costs: Sample Collection	\$582	
Annual Report: Sr. REHS	\$1,665	
Education/Training; REHS or Haz Mat Staff	\$5,200	
Transportation Costs: Education	\$485	
Laboratory	\$14,400	
County Surveyor- GIS Division		\$5,325
GIS Analyst II @ Annual Salary/Benefits \$97,849 3 field surveys per year @ 10 hrs ea = 30 hrs Internet update 20 weeks @ 2 hrs per update = 40 hrs Design GIS data tables and upload = 40 hrs Total Annual Hours = 110 or 0.05 FTE	\$5,175	
Transportation Costs 300+ miles @ \$0.485 /mile	\$150	
Sheriff		\$132,211
Deputy Sheriff II (2 bodies @ 0.5 FTE ea to RTMP)	\$90,980	
Community Services Officers (2 bodies @ 0.5 FTE ea to RTMP)	\$37,331	
Fuel Purchases	\$3,900	
TOTAL		\$416,494

We would view the near term stability (five years with SB 742) of the OHV in-lieu fees as firm seed money from which the County can build revenue from a variety of sources to undertake the management, maintenance and improvement of the Rubicon Trail. By investing in both the DAPG's efforts to manage this recreation asset, and some level of effort by DOT's Engineering support, the building blocks are laid for implementing the RTMP and for competing for grant revenue to support both law enforcement and trail monitoring, restoration, maintenance, and improvement.